UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,194	12/23/2000	Dann E. Kroeger	ATUBP001/44556/03318	1329

7590 12/17/2004

HOVEY WILLIAMS TIMMONS & COLLINS
2405 GRAND BLVD SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

EXAMINER	
SAIN, GAUTAM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/746,194	KROEGER, DANN E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 May 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/01*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant cancelled claims 1-19. This examination is for claims 20-42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1-1) Claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wares (US 2001/0044768, provisional application filed Jan 28, 2000, 60/178,825), in view of Matsuzaki et al (US 5767848, issued Jun 1998).

Regarding claim 20, Wares teaches

a project task manager code segment operable to access a project task record populated with project task data related to the project, wherein the project task record is linked to an electronic document related to completing the task (ie., web page for managing projects online; paragraph 95-97)(ie., managing task for construction project management; para 12);

a document manager code segment operable to receive and store the electronic document (ie., document management, viewing , ... on Internet)(para 14),

a communications manager code segment operable to receive and store an

' electronic communication related to the project (ie., bid submission by engineers for bids for project, via Internet)(para 3);

a bid manager code segment operable to communicate the one or more tasks and to receive a bid relating to cgst and time required to complete the one or more tasks (ie., database of ruse for schedule and cost information for a specific project);

a resource and contact manager code segment is operable to store and maintain a categorized list of personnel and company information relating to the project (ie., participants in the bidding process. Architects, ... contractors)(para 18, 59; fig 2);

a pro-active manager code segment operable to monitor a status of the project (ie., tracking the status on the project for response to bids)(para 99, fig 9), *the one or more tasks, the electronic document* (ie., document management)(para 14), *the electronic communication, and the bid and*

a reports manager code segment operable to generate a respons regarding one or more aspects of the project or the one or more tasks (ie., web page suitable for tracking the response status for bids. The web page display to a use is a report)(para 99; fig 9).

Wares does not expressly teach, but Matsuzaki teaches *to notify a contact person in a pre-defined manner when a pre-defined condition occurs related to the status, wherein the contact person may be an appropriate contact person selected from the list maintained by the resource and contact manager* (ie., notifying means to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding

target values)(col 2, lines 28-35)(ie., members are appropriate persons that are notified)(col 2, lines 28-34);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include notifying means to a member to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target values as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 21, Wares teaches *wherein an electronic form provides an interface for populating the project task record and for editing the project task data* (ie., using the 'Edit' feature user can edit data relating to bids)(para 99, fig 9)(examiner broadly interprets the electronic form as well known in this art)(as evidenced by Matsuzaki, fig 13, which shows an electronic form for tasks).

Regarding claim 22, Wares teaches

wherein the electronic form including a hyperlink to the electronic document (ie., user can select links; and crate project folder site by entering the name in the form to complete the site name, which contain the document)(para 101, fig 13).

Regarding claim 23, Wares teaches

a code segment for creating and maintaining a log related to populating the project task record and

to editing the project task data (ie screens allow user to monitor and manage bid responses and edit the data for each response)(para 99, fig 9).

Regarding claim 24, Wares does not expressly teach, but Matsuzaki teaches

wherein the project task manager code segment is further operable to graphically display a temporal progression of the one or more tasks (ie., time indication section, schedule bars correspond to times)(col 9, lines 5-15; fig 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include a time indication section with schedule bars corresponding to times as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 25, Ware teaches

the project task manager code segment is further operable to cause to be displayed an actual cost (ie., cost information of a project bid)(para 53) and Ware does not expressly teach, but Matsuzaki teaches a budget (ie., means for estimating cost, performance)(col 2, lines 18—21) related to completion of the project.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include means for estimating cost, performance as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system

capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 26, Ware teaches

wherein the document manager code segment is operable to monitor the need for and status of a particular electronic document (ie., document management, viewing, redlining)(para 14), *and Wares does not expressly teach, but Matsuzaki teaches to notify a contact person in a pre-defined manner when a pre-defined condition occurs relating to the particular electronic document* (ie., notifying means to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target values)(col 2, lines 28-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include means for notifying as to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target value as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 27, Wares does not expressly teach, but Matsuzaki teaches *wherein the contact person is be an appropriate contact person selected from the list maintained by the resource and contact manager code segment* (ie., members are notified)(col 2,l ines 28-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include notifying members as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 28, Wares teaches wherein the pre-defined condition includes not having received the particular electronic document by a pre-established date (ie., deadline for bid submission by 2pm, inherently the time of a particular day or date).

Regarding claim 29, Wares teaches *wherein the electronic document is editable, and the document manager code segment is operable to maintain a log related to editing of the document* (ie., web page allows user to monitor and manage the bid process documents, "track bid response")(para 99, fig 9, item 94).

Regarding claim 30, Wares teaches *the communication manager code segment is operable to interface with an existing electronic communication medium in order to receive the electronic communication* (ie., Internet)(para 6).

Regarding claim 31, Wares teaches *the electronic communication is an electronic mail message* (ie., e-mail)(para 6).

Regarding claim 32, Wares teaches *the electronic communication is a fax* (ie., facsimilie)(para 12).

Regarding claim 33, Wares teaches *wherein the communication manager code segment is operable to monitor a status of a particular stored electronic communication* (ie., Responses to Bid and tracking bid responses)(para 99, fig 9, item 94) *and to notify a contact person in a pre-defined manner when a predefined condition occurs relating to the particular stored electronic communication*(ie., notifying means to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target values)(col 2, lines 28-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include means for notifying as to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target value as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 34, Wares teaches *communications manager code seqment is operable to associate a response date with the particular stored electronic communication, and the pre-defined condition includes a lack of a response by the response date* (ie., deadline for bid, by 2PM, inherently including a particular day/date; para 3; Fig 9, para 99 shows monitoring responses to Bids and the bids with no responses).

Regarding claim 35, Wares teaches *wherein the bid includes a bidder identifier and a bid amount* (ie., the web page shows Company, Contact and Bid Amount)(para 99, fig 9).

Regarding claim 36, Wares teaches *the bid manager code segment is operable to automatically electronically communicate acceptance of a particular bid* (ie., 'Accepted' bid)(para 99, fig 9 on web page).

Regarding claim 37, Wares teaches *wherein the bid manager code segment is operable to maintain a log related to receiving the bid* (ie., 'Track Bid Responses').

Regarding claim 38, Wares does not teach, but Matsuzaki teaches *wherein the contact person, pre-defined manner of notification, and pre-defined condition may be designated and defined in the project task record* (ie., notifying means to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target values)(col 2, lines 28-35)(ie., members are appropriate persons that are notified)(col 2, lines 28-34);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares to include notifying means to a member to the effect of progress that do not meet the corresponding target values as taught by Matsuzaki, providing the benefit of a development support system capable of supporting management work on coordinating the product development project and estimated data representing the progress of the new product development project (Matsuzaki, col 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 39, Wares *teaches the pre-defined manner of notification includes email* (ie., email)(para 6).

Regarding claim 41, Wares teaches *the pre-defined manner of notification includes fax* (ie., facsimilie)(para 12).

1-2) Claims 40, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wares (as cited above), in view of Matsuzaki et al (as cited above), further in view of Gundewar et al (US 6281610, filed Jan 1999).

Regarding claim 40, Wares in view of Matsuzaki does not expressly teach, but Gundewar teaches *the pre-defined manner of notification includes voicemail* (ie., voicemail)(col 7, line 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares in view of Matsuzaki to include voicemail as taught by Gundewar, providing the benefit of a system and method for implementing project procedures where problems have been eliminated that have been substantially reduced or eliminated for project management (Gundewar, para 1, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 42, Wares in view of Matsuzaki does not expressly teach, but Gundewar teaches *the responds manager code segment is further operable to receive periodic updates regarding project progress and, based thereupon, to include in the respond an updated project cost and schedule* (ie., project repository module updates the status of the project in status page of project workspace)(col 9, lines 4-9)(updating cost and schedule are taught by Wares in paragraph 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wares in view of Matsuzaki to include updating the status of the project in status page of project workspace as taught by Gundewar, providing the benefit of a system and method for implementing project

procedures where problems have been eliminated that have been substantially reduced or eliminated for project management (Gundewar, para 1, lines 35-42).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

GS

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER